



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

According to Iliad 10. 372, Diomedes hurled his spear over Dolon's shoulder, *ἐκὼν δ' ἡμάρτανε φωτός*. This force of the word would make our passage mean: 'but of his own accord no one would choose them'. There is perhaps an allusion to line 45 where Hector contrasts *καλὸν εἶδος* with *βίη* and *ἀλκή*, so that Paris means to say, 'I would not voluntarily choose good looks rather than strength and valor'. The clause thus forms a transition from his apology for his effeminate appearance to his proposal of the duel with Menelaus.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

WACKERNAGEL ON THE TEXT OF HOMER

Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY may be glad to have their attention called to an important article on the Attic Influence upon our text of Homer, published by J. Wackernagel in Glotta 7. 161-319. The article is entitled Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer. No scholar with a knowledge of scientific Greek grammar has doubted the presence of Atticisms in our text of Homer, but only a few, probably, have hitherto realized how considerable the Attic element really is.

Wackernagel divides his material into two groups. The first and larger group consists of Atticisms which may be explained as modernizations of originally Ionic words or forms. For example, our text of Homer presents the future of *δμνυμι* in its Attic form as *δμοῦμαι*, *δμεῖται*, etc. Now Ionic would have contracted *δμέομαι* into *δμεῦμαι* and *δμόσται* into *δμούται*; and so either *δμοῦμαι* or *δμεῖται* must be due to Attic influence. But since the Attic and Ionic forms had the same prosodic value, it is quite possible that the original Homeric text was in this respect consistently Ionic.

In his second group Wackernagel places Atticisms which cannot be translated into Ionic without destroying the meter, and which, therefore, must be due to the original composers of the lines in which they stand. A part of the material here discussed is more or less dubious, but, after all allowances have been made, there remains a considerable residue of forms and idioms which must stand as valid evidence for the Attic origin of single lines or, in some cases, of longer passages of the poems. For example, there are two such forms in the introduction to the Teichoscopia in Iliad 3. In line 153 we read *ἦντ'* for Homeric *ἦατο* and later Ionic (*κατ')* *ἦατο*, where both the Atticism and the impossibility of emendation are beyond question. The phrase *δενδρέφ' ἐφεζόμενοι*, which most manuscripts and printed texts present in 152, will not scan unless we read the Attic form *δένδρφ*. It has to be admitted, however, that *δένδρφ* does not actually appear in the text, and that one manuscript remedies the metrical defect by reading *ἐζόμενοι*.

It is not likely that all of Wackernagel's conclusions will stand the test of time, but one may at least say

that this is the most important grammatical contribution to the Homeric question that has appeared for many years.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEWS

Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria.

By Gustave Adolphus Harrer. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1915). Pp. 94.

The present learned and heavily documented dissertation is devoted to chronological studies of the sequence in office of the provincial governors of Syria. The peculiar order of treatment, whereby the governors from 69-194 A. D. are considered separately (pages 11-42), and before any notice is paid to those of the period anterior to 69 A. D. (pages 63-65), seems to be due to the fact that the list of governors from the beginning down to the great revolt, as given in the latest edition of Schürer's *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes* (1904), was so nearly complete as to leave opportunity for only a few scattered notes, whereas the accession of new material since the publication of Liebenam's *Die Legaten in den Römischen Provinzen von Augustus bis Diocletian* (1888) suggested the need of a thoroughgoing revision of the lists for this period. The study is essentially, therefore, a revision of Liebenam's work, and as such it marks a really considerable contribution to knowledge as compared with the average doctoral dissertation. However, since it is a series of discussions of minute chronological problems, it is accordingly impossible to summarize the contents, otherwise than to notice that, in addition to what has already been indicated, similar lists are prepared for the governors of Syria Coele and Syria Phoenice from 194-circa 300 A. D., and the procurators of Syria, Syria Coele and Syria Phoenice. Then follows an interesting discussion of the proper date and course of the revolt of Pescennius Niger, in which Wilcken's view that it was confined to 193 A. D. is firmly established; after that comes a short examination of the date of the division of Syria; then a note on C. I. L. III, 6169; a brief Index Nominum, which would have been more valuable had it been expanded to include all the principal persons and topics discussed; and, finally, a short Appendix. The whole gives evidence of industry, sobriety of judgment, and correct methods of research. I should like in particular to note an emendation (page 29) in *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes* III, 1274 where the commonly accepted reading *ἐπὶ Ἀπικίων* is convincingly emended to *ἐπὶ Σουλπικίων*.

The proofreading has not been done very carefully, but since the errors will not mislead the specialist, and dissertations are not likely to reach a second edition, I see no use in solemnly rehearsing such petty blemishes. There are other blemishes, however, which are not to be so easily explained or condoned. Thus "Gk." is an unfortunate abbreviation for the

German adjective 'Griechisch' (pages 7, 28, 36, 62, 84); "Oesterreichen" is not the proper adjectival form (6); "Vindobona" is not the locative case (6); von Premenstein is called sometimes "Premenstein", sometimes "von Premenstein", while von Domaszewski is merely "Domaszewski"; the title for the *Neue Jahrbücher* is wrong. I do not grasp the principle upon which the table of abbreviations has been prepared. If such common abbreviations as "C. I. L.", "Philol.", "Head, Hist. Num.", etc., are to be given for the benefit of the veriest layman, then why not the abbreviations which are used for other things quite as recondite? For example, what would the layman, who is not supposed to understand "C. I. L.", make of the very first citation, "Jos. B. J. VII, 3, 4", or "Dig. XL, 2, 5", or "Borghesi V, 92", or "Müller H. Buch IV, 2, p. 183", or "Bull. Ac. Roy. Belg.-Lettr. (1905), p. 208", and the like?

There is, finally, a surprising amount of loose or even faulty English. I have in mind sentences like the following: "His connection with Martius Verius . . . practically proves him governor earlier" (91); "Ritterling assumes that Cornelianus was at once recalled, apparently for the purpose of inserting A. Larcus Piscus as governor at this point" (30, n. 130); "Mommson's view is not shown conclusive" (20). The word "only" is not infrequently misplaced (31, 37, 47, 76), and the extremely short Preface is disfigured by two references to the dissertation as a "thesis" (what thesis can it conceivably maintain?), and by the unhappy locution "I would like".

Classical scholars will make little headway in pressing the claims of Greek and Latin for wider recognition in our schemes of Secondary and Collegiate education if they themselves employ slipshod English.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire. By Clinton Walker Keyes. Princeton University Dissertation of 1913. Princeton University Press (1915). Pp. 54.

It has long been known that Diocletian favored the appointment of *equites* instead of *senatores* as provincial governors, but, though the inscriptions plainly showed that this policy was not original with him, the precise provinces, periods and conditions in which the change was brought about had never been determined. To this problem Mr. Keyes devoted his attention, and, considering the scanty and frequently inconclusive nature of the evidence, he was able to reach fairly satisfactory results. He finds that prior to the reign of Domitian the transfer had been effected in Arabia (under Gallienus), Dalmatia, Numidia, Pontus et Bithynia, and possibly Germania Superior, but not in Hispania Tarraconensis, or Syria Coele. In the case of the other provinces there is either no evidence at all, or the evidence is inconclusive. He also conjectures with some plausibility that Aurelian and Probus were mainly responsible (after Gallienus,

of course) for the innovation, but refrains from speculating upon the motives for the change in general, or for the selection of one province rather than another in which to institute it. In a note (pages 16 ff.) the plausible suggestion is made that men who held the office of *praefecti urbi* in the third century were usually *consules ordinarii* at or about the same time.

Chapter II (18-48) contains the evidence for the transfer of the command of a legion from a senatorial *legatus* to an equestrian *praefectus*, and is mainly occupied with a detailed discussion of the offices of the *praefectus (castrorum)* and the *praefectus legionis*, in which some criticisms that cannot readily be summarized here are made upon the views of Wilmanns and von Domaszewski. The statement of Aurelius Victor, that Gallienus was the first to withhold military commands from senators, is supported by inscriptional evidence of both a positive and a negative character. The policy of transferring important commands of *vexillationes* to *equites* is then traced with similar (of course, expected) results. In the final chapter, The Separation of Civil and Military Government in the Provinces (49-54), it is pointed out that this separation was necessarily involved in the notable act of Gallienus concerning military commands, and therefore that here again Diocletian merely completed and gave universal application to a reform which had been begun long before his time.

An interesting and convincing emendation and supplement (unfortunately disfigured by a misprint) is that made on page 13 in C. I. L. VIII, 7001, where *Q. Annlati Celsi* and *A]nnatius Celsus* are proposed for the former supplement and reading *Munlati Celsi* and *M]unatius Celsus*.

Of course the present monograph is devoted essentially to marshalling evidence for what was already recognized in its broad outlines, and (in common with most dissertations) shows no very surprising or novel results. But the method is excellent, the presentation clear and concise, and the conclusions reliable, while good judgment is shown in recognizing the limits of what the evidence can actually prove. The only notable defects are a somewhat inconsistent method of citation, and the failure to provide an index. The latter, in the present almost overwhelming volume of philological literature, when every effort should be made to save the time of all fellow-scholars, is almost an unsocial act.

A query might also be raised about the exact form of the title. Does not the author really mean "in the Roman Empire during the Third Century <of the Christian Era>"? At all events this is the sense in which he actually employs the term "third century". If, on the other hand, the intention was actually to introduce an era reckoned from the foundation of the Empire, the result would be, I fear, an unnecessary complication in chronological references.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

W. A. OLDFATHER.